

Interlayer tunneling in double-layer quantum Hall pseudo-ferromagnets

L. Balents¹ and L. Radzihovsky²

¹ *Physics Department, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106*

² *Physics Department, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309*

(Date: February 1, 2008)

We show that the interlayer tunneling I-V in double-layer quantum Hall states displays a rich behavior which depends on the relative magnitude of sample size, voltage length scale, current screening, disorder and thermal lengths. For weak tunneling, we predict a negative differential conductance of a power-law shape crossing over to a sharp zero-bias peak. An in-plane magnetic field splits this zero-bias peak, leading instead to a “derivative” feature at $V_B(B_{||}) = 2\pi\hbar v B_{||} d / e\phi_0$, which gives a direct measure of the dispersion of the Goldstone mode corresponding to the spontaneous symmetry breaking of the double-layer Hall state.

PACS: 73.20.Dx, 11.15.-q, 14.80.Hv, 73.20.Mf

Through a series of experimental and theoretical papers, it is now well-established that a bilayer of two-dimensional (2d) electron gases (2DEGs), when the layers are sufficiently close, exhibits an incompressible Quantum Hall (QH) state at a total filling fraction $\nu = 1$, [1–3], even when interlayer tunneling is negligible. [4]. The QH state is stabilized by the Coulomb exchange interaction, which leads to *spontaneous* interlayer phase coherence, with the layer phase difference ϕ , the “phason”, as the corresponding Goldstone mode. Because the layer index may also be viewed as a pseudo-spin-1/2 degree of freedom, this state is also known as the QH FerroMagnet (QHFM), and the phasons as (pseudo-)magnons.

The first *direct* experimental evidence for this mode was obtained recently by Spielman, et al. [5]. For bilayers with small separations d , they observed a giant and spectacularly narrow zero bias peak in the inter-layer tunneling conductance at low T , a feature that naturally emerges from our study of the QHFM. We find rich variations of the *non-linear* tunneling conductance $G(V) = dI/dV$ as a function of interlayer voltage V , tunneling strength Δ_0 , disorder, temperature, and applied parallel magnetic field $B_{||}$. Two particularly appealing and testable predictions of our theory are: (1) a finite-bias feature in $G(V)$ at a voltage $V_B = \hbar\omega(Q = 2\pi B_{||}d/\phi_0)$ which tracks the collective mode dispersion relation $\omega(Q)$ as a function of $B_{||}$ ($\phi_0 = hc/e$) and (2) the appearance of a power-law *negative differential resistance* at higher bias in cleaner samples. For clarity, below we first summarize different regimes and results, and then give a brief sketch of the calculations.

We focus here on voltages eV below the QH charge gap Ω , where the only available bulk excitations are phasons, described in the absence of impurities by the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{\rho_s}{2} \left[\frac{1}{v^2} (\partial_t \phi)^2 - |\nabla \phi|^2 \right] - \frac{\Delta_0}{2\pi\ell^2} \cos[\phi - \omega t - Qx], \quad (1)$$

where v is the pseudo-magnon “sound” velocity, ρ_s is the phase stiffness, [4] $\ell = \sqrt{\hbar c / eB}$ is the magnetic length,

Q is the in-plane “magnetic wavevector” $Q = 2\pi B_{||}d/\phi_0$ due to applied $\mathbf{B}_{||} = B_{||}\hat{\mathbf{y}}$, and $\omega = eV/\hbar$. The only other low-energy modes are *edge states*, which carry the in-phase, in-plane current at low temperatures.

For weak tunneling, characterized by a “naive” dimensionless coupling $\delta_0 \equiv \Delta/\rho_s \ll 1$, the tunneling current density $J(V)$ can be computed in a controlled perturbation theory (but see below). There are three interesting sub-cases. First, for the pure system, we find

$$J(V) = \begin{cases} J_0 \delta_0 \left(\frac{\mathcal{E}_\ell}{k_B T} \right)^2 \left(\frac{k_B T}{eV} \right)^{2-\eta} \text{sgn}(V), & eV \ll k_B T, \\ \sim \exp(-eV/k_B T) & eV \gg k_B T. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where, $\Delta \equiv C_Q \Delta_0$ is the tunneling amplitude downward renormalized by quantum fluctuations, with $C_Q < 1$ a constant defined below. In above $J_0 \equiv e\Delta/\hbar 2\pi\ell^2$ is the tunneling current density scale, and $\mathcal{E}_\ell \equiv \hbar v/\ell$ is the ultra-violet energy cutoff associated with the magnetic length ℓ (presumably $O(\Omega)$ for d/ℓ of $O(1)$), $\eta = k_B T / 2\pi\rho_s$ is the familiar Kosterlitz-Thouless (KT) exponent [6] controlling the asymptotic quasi-long range order (qlro) of the double-layer QH state. The exponential suppression at high-bias is a kinematic consequence of the lack of zero momentum excitations in this energy range.

Note that the above I-V displays *negative differential resistance*, and a peak in $J(V)$ as $V \rightarrow 0^+$. The physics of this peak is the appearance of *excitons*, or electron-hole pairs from opposite layers as sharply defined low energy excitations in the QHFM, whose spectral function is directly probed by the tunneling conductance.

Second, sufficiently strong impurities modify the transport (and other aspects of the physics), introducing a number of new length scales. We discuss their effects primarily in the regime in which tunneling remains perturbative (but see below). If disorder is not too weak (weak impurities do not significantly modify the behavior), significant quenched-in *static* deformations in ϕ ap-

pear beyond a length ξ , removing the constraint of in-plane momentum conservation. Then for $eV \ll k_B T$,

$$J_d(V) \approx J_0 \delta_0 \left(\frac{\xi}{\ell} \right)^2 \left(\frac{eV}{k_B T} \right)^\alpha \text{sgn}(V), \quad (3)$$

where naively $\alpha = \eta$, but preliminary investigations suggest that at low temperature quantum effects can lead to an enhanced $\alpha < 1$. [7] At large bias, $eV \gg \hbar v/\xi \gg k_B T$, the current decays exponentially ($I_d \sim \exp(-eV\xi/\hbar v)$).

Third, in the presence of an additional weak $B_{||}$ field the zero-bias peak of Eq.2 is split by $V_B = \hbar v Q/e$,

$$J_Q(V) = J_0 \frac{\delta_0 \mathcal{E}_\ell}{\ell Q k_B T} \sum_{s=\pm 1} s \left| \frac{k_B T}{eV - sQv\hbar} \right|^{1-\eta}. \quad (4)$$

Eq. 4 is valid for weak impurities, $Q\xi \gg 1$, except in a narrow region $|eV - \hbar v Q| \lesssim \hbar v/\xi$, in which the singular peak is rounded by disorder and strong-coupling physics. Consequently we find that the location of the tunneling conductance feature (which is a peak for $Q = 0$ and is of a “derivative” shape form for $Q > 0$) maps out the wavevector (Q) dispersion of the Goldstone mode associated with the transition to the double-layer QH state and with the broken U(1) symmetry.

The naive application of the above perturbative results, $I_{\text{uns}} = J(V)L^2$ (for a square $L \times L$ sample), can break down for several reasons. First, in the experimentally relevant geometry with contacts at opposite sample ends, there is necessarily a variation of the chemical potential in the plane of the 2DEG in order to maintain the in-plane current. Thus the V in Eqs. 2-3 becomes spatially dependent, and moreover, for sufficiently large samples most of the voltage drop is in-plane. Second, and more interestingly, the perturbation theory itself breaks down at low bias. This occurs once the voltage scale $L_V = \hbar v/eV$ becomes longer than a “penetration depth” $\lambda(V, T)$ (provided $\lambda < L$) defined below. Physically, λ represents a screening length beyond which the in-plane out-of-phase currents become too large to support a uniform tunneling current in the absence of another channel (e.g. contacts or edge states) to carry away the transferred charge.

In the pure case, we find the *non-equilibrium* penetration depth $\lambda(V, T) \approx \lambda_0(\lambda_0/L_V)(k_B T/eV)^{\eta/2}$. A rather idealized experimental geometry for which this prediction may directly apply is for two parallel contacts to the *same side* (but different layer) of the bilayer. Then the transport occurs only within a distance λ of the contacts, within which the tunneling current *density* is comparable to that in Eq. 2 and therefore the current is given by $I_{\text{scr}} = L\lambda(V, T)J(V)$. Note that in the “perturbative” high-bias regime $eV/k_B T \gg [\delta_0(\mathcal{E}_\ell/k_B T)]^{2/(4-\eta)}$ (equivalently defined by $L_V < \lambda(V, T)$), $\lambda(V, T)$ is always longer than $\lambda_{\text{equil}}(T) = \lambda_0(\lambda_0 k_B T/\hbar v)^{\eta/(4-\eta)}$ (a length that one would have naively expected from an *equilibrium* calculation), but reduces to it for a lower bias. For

large tunneling, $\delta_0 > 1$, the penetration depth is instead given by a significantly shorter strong coupling expression $\lambda_0 = \ell\sqrt{2\pi\rho_s}/\Delta$. For the more experimentally relevant geometry with contacts on opposite sides of the sample, the tunneling current must be carried primarily along the sample *edges*, as in the quantum Hall regime only the edge states can carry the *symmetric* current needed by charge conservation. With $\xi < \infty$, screening is reduced and the corresponding “dirty” penetration depth becomes $\lambda_d(V) \sim \lambda_0(\lambda_0/\xi)(k_B T/eV)^{\eta/2} = (L_V/\xi)\lambda(V, T)$, provided the self-consistent condition $\xi < \lambda$ and new physics does not intervene at lengths smaller than λ_d .

Additional randomness-induced phenomena can also occur at scales beyond ξ , which corresponds to the length at which unbound *quenched* vortices are present. Although at low temperatures vortex motion is exponentially suppressed due to the weakness of thermal activation and quantum tunneling, because it is nevertheless finite, it leads to *temporal* fluctuations of the interlayer phase ϕ (which we may crudely call “decoherence”) for times longer than the exponentially long time scale τ_{vort} associated with vortex motion. Therefore, provided any unbound vortices are induced, we expect an exponentially diverging zero-bias conductance peak $dI/dV|_{V=0} \sim \tau_{\text{vort}}^{1-\eta}|\Delta|^2$ of width $\hbar/\tau_{\text{vort}}$. Ultimately, this divergence with reducing temperature is cut off by mesoscopic effects in finite samples – phase “diffusion” due to energy and current exchange with the leads, tunneling contributions from edge modes, etc. – and by effects non-perturbative in the tunneling, to which we now turn. Finally, for strong enough disorder even the gauge glass order may be destroyed at $T = 0$. The nature of the resulting state and the transition to it remain unresolved.

All the above results assume that $J(V)$ (at least in a large region near the contact) is perturbative in the tunneling Δ . At sufficiently low V and T , however, this perturbation theory breaks down. We first consider the clean limit, in which the “naive” dimensionless coupling that controls this expansion is $\delta(T) \equiv \delta_0(\mathcal{E}_\ell/k_B T)^2$. The true expansion parameter is $\delta_{\text{eff}} = \delta(k_B T/eV)^{(4-\eta)/2}$, as can be seen from standard sine-Gordon RG analysis. In the strong interlayer tunneling regime, defined by $eV/k_B T < \delta^{2/(4-\eta)}$, currents are screened in the bulk on the scale λ . For contacts on the same sample edge, tunnel currents run only near this edge and the I–V curve measures the conductance of the leads. For contacts on opposite sample edges, the in-plane current can be carried only by the edge states, and the model must be extended to incorporate these degrees of freedom. However, on general grounds (see below) we expect that the power-law I–V, displaying negative differential resistance, below this strong coupling voltage, generically crosses over to a linear I–V, corresponding to a large, narrow conductance peak, as observed in experiments. [5]

We now present the highlights of calculations that lead to the tunneling results summarized above, deferring most

of the details [7] to a future publication. We focus on the tunneling current density $J = \frac{e\Delta_0}{2\pi\ell^2\hbar} \langle \sin[\phi - \omega t - Qx] \rangle$, where the angular brackets denote an expectation value in the non-equilibrium steady state at time t averaged over a thermal ensemble of initial conditions in the far past. Note that, in the mesoscopic regime in which $\hbar v/L > eV, k_B T$, it is crucial to include the degrees of freedom of the contacts in the non-equilibrium ensemble.

Standard time-dependent perturbation theory, to leading nontrivial order in Δ_0 gives the *current density*

$$J = J_0 \frac{\Delta_0}{2\pi\ell^2\hbar} \text{Re} \int d^2\mathbf{r} \int_0^\infty dt e^{i(Qx - \omega t) - 0^+ t} C(\mathbf{r}, t), \quad (5)$$

where $C(\mathbf{r}, t) = \theta(t) \langle [e^{i\phi(\mathbf{r}, t)}, e^{-i\phi(\mathbf{0}, 0)}] \rangle_0$, calculated using the unperturbed Hamiltonian with $\Delta_0 = 0$.

A straightforward calculation gives

$$C(\mathbf{r}, t) = C_Q e^{-G_{\text{th}}(\mathbf{r}, t)} (e^{-G_Q(\mathbf{r}, t)} - \text{c.c.}), \quad (6)$$

where $C_Q = [\cosh(\pi\mathcal{E}_\ell/2k_B T)]^{-2\eta} \approx e^{-\hbar v/\ell\rho_s}$, and

$$G_{\text{th}}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \frac{v\hbar}{\rho_s} \int \frac{d^2q}{8\pi^2 q} |e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r} - ivqt} - 1|^2 n_B(\hbar vq), \quad (7a)$$

$$G_Q(\mathbf{r}, t) = \frac{v\hbar}{4\pi\rho_s} \left[\frac{\theta(r - vt)}{\sqrt{r^2 - v^2 t^2}} - i \frac{\theta(vt - r)}{\sqrt{v^2 t^2 - r^2}} \right], \quad (7b)$$

are the “thermal” and “quantum” propagators and $n_B(\epsilon) = [e^{\epsilon/k_B T} - 1]^{-1}$. Eqs. 7a-7b neglect the quantization of the total charge across the bilayer capacitor, and therefore misses Coulomb blockade effects, which are small since for large systems, the charging energy $e^2/C = \hbar^2 v^2/\rho_s L^2$ is much less than the ballistic “level spacing” $\hbar v/L$. Aside from the presence of G_{th} , Eqs. 5-7b are identical to the result of *classical* perturbation theory in the equation of motion following from Eq. 1.

$G_Q(\mathbf{r}, t)$ is independent of T and hence reflects the quantum dynamics of the system (for $\Delta = 0$). By inspection of Eq. 6, only when $G_Q(\mathbf{r}, t)$ contains a non-zero *imaginary* part is $C(\mathbf{r}, t)$ non-zero. Therefore the tunneling current is non-zero only for $vt > r$, reflecting causality. Since we are interested in low energy scales, ($eV, \hbar vQ, k_B T \ll \mathcal{E}_\ell$) we expect the tunneling current to be dominated by the large r, t behavior of $C(r, t)$, with $\rho_s t \gtrsim \rho_s r/v \gg \hbar$. Then, except in a very narrow range (which contributes negligibly to the current) in which $0 < vt - r \ll \hbar v/\rho_s$, $G_Q \ll 1$, leading to

$$C(r, t) \approx -\frac{iv\hbar}{2\pi\rho_s} C_Q e^{-G_{\text{th}}(r, t)} \frac{\theta(vt - r)}{\sqrt{v^2 t^2 - r^2}}. \quad (8)$$

The effect of thermal fluctuations are encoded in $G_{\text{th}}(r, t)$. The tunneling current contains two contributions. Modes at time scales smaller than the thermal time, $\tau_T = \hbar/k_B T$ give $T = 0$ contributions with $e^{-G_{\text{th}}} \approx 1$. In contrast, for modes with $vt > r \gg v\tau_T$, $G_{\text{th}}(r, t) \gg 1$, with dominant contribution coming from

thermally activated modes with $\hbar vq \ll k_B T$, for which $n_B(\epsilon) \approx k_B T/\epsilon$ and the upper cutoff on q given by $k_B T/v\hbar$. Computing the integral over $\mathbf{q}$ in Eq. 7a under such approximation we find

$$e^{-G_{\text{th}}(r, t)} \approx \tanh \left\{ \left[\frac{v\tau_T}{vt + \sqrt{v^2 t^2 - r^2}} \right]^\eta \right\}. \quad (9)$$

Eq. 9 must be taken together with an implicit causality constraint $r < vt$, (see Eq. 8), so that the argument of $\tanh$ is always real and of order $(\tau_T/t)^\eta$ for $t \gg \tau_T$. The well-known KT theory [6] restricts the applicability of Eq. 9 to $\eta < 1/4$, for which the *qlro*’ed phase is stable to thermally-induced vortices. Finally, for bilayers which are not too large, an IR cut-off should be introduced to restrict $r < L$. The behavior of $C(r, t)$ for $t > L/v$, is strongly modified by the presence of the contacts even at $T = 0$. This provides an additional source of “decoherence” to smooth the singularities of the low-bias tunneling conductance for $eV < \hbar v/L$.

We now apply these results for the Green’s functions to the analysis of the tunneling current in a macroscopic, clean system, with $L > L_V$, where the results are independent of the contact physics. On physical ground we expect that for the most parts our predictions will also extend into the mesoscopic regime, $L < L_V$, with the mesoscopic modes (not fully accounted for by the ϕ -only model) only contributing a featureless background to the tunneling I-V. Combining Eqs. 8 and 9 with Eq. 5, we arrive at a naive perturbative expression for the tunneling current *density* in an infinite sample,

$$J_Q(V) \approx \frac{J_0 \Delta}{4\pi\rho_s} \frac{C_Q v}{2\pi\ell^2} \int_0^\infty dt \sin(eVt/\hbar) \int_0^{vt} dr r \frac{J_0(Qr)}{\sqrt{v^2 t^2 - r^2}} \times \tanh \left\{ \left[\frac{v\tau_T}{(vt + \sqrt{v^2 t^2 - r^2})} \right]^\eta \right\}, \quad (10)$$

which readily leads to Eqs. 2, 4.

Based on an equilibrium RG analysis, these expressions would naively appear to be valid in the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$, provided $eV/k_B T \gg \delta^{2/(4-\eta)}$. The true regime of validity is, however, more restrictive. In particular, Eq. 10 predicts a non-zero steady-state current *density* in the infinite system. This would require that either the in-plane (out-of-phase) current or the charge density across the bilayer “capacitor” be *infinite*. The apparent violation of charge conservation signals a breakdown of the perturbative results for $L > \lambda$. Technically it occurs because even large bias V is not sufficient to cut off all long scale perturbative divergences. However, the remaining divergences are weaker and therefore the length scale $\lambda(V, T)$ over which perturbation theory is valid is *longer* than the equilibrium screening length $\lambda_{\text{equil}}(T) = \lambda_0(\lambda_0 k_B T/\hbar v)^{\eta/(4-\eta)}$ relevant for low bias. Physically, $\lambda(V)$ may be estimated by considering a steady state, for which the continuity equation reduces

to $\frac{e}{\hbar}\rho_s\nabla^2\phi = J(V)$, since the in-plane pseudo-spin supercurrent density $j_s = \frac{e}{\hbar}\rho_s\nabla\phi$. The naive, *uniform* $J(V)$ can be maintained only over lengths such that the mean ϕ grows by an amount $\ll 1$. Thus $\lambda(V) \approx \sqrt{e\rho_s/\hbar J(V)}$, which leads to the result quoted in the introduction. To support this interpretation, we note that $\lambda(V)$ reduces to $\lambda_{\text{equil}}(T)$ if the naive boundary of perturbation theory, $eV/k_BT \approx \delta^{2/(4-\eta)}$, is approached. For the case of both contacts to the same sample edge ($x = 0$) and $L > \lambda(V)$, we have verified perturbatively in Δ that the *non-uniform* current density profile is $J(x, V) = J(V)F(x/\lambda(V))$, with $F(\chi) \rightarrow 0$ for $\chi \rightarrow \infty$ and $F(\chi) \sim 1 - O(\chi^2)$.

The most significant effect of weak disorder is an effective random vector potential $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{r})$ ($\nabla\phi \rightarrow \nabla\phi - \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{r})$) in Eq. 1. [8,7] This arises from the binding of charge to flux in the QH regime, but has *short-range* correlations since it is a physical field. Thus in the zero tunneling limit, for weak disorder we arrive at a 2 + 1-dimensional XY model with random vector potential (XYRVP). The XYRVP is known to have a stable low T phase with qlro and no unbound vortices below a critical strength of disorder. [9] At some threshold strength of disorder, vortices will be induced, and the system is effectively in a *gauge glass* regime. The vortices introduce an asymptotically exponential decay in r and t

$$C(\mathbf{r}, t) \rightarrow C(\mathbf{r}, t)e^{-r/\xi}e^{-t/\tau_{\text{vort}}}. \quad (11)$$

The characteristic length ξ diverges as the threshold disorder strength is approached from above, and is finite above it, even at $T = 0$. Vortex localization implies that τ_{vort} diverges as $T \rightarrow 0$, so $\tau_{\text{vort}} \gg \xi/v$. Indeed, there is very likely an intermediate regime $\xi/v \ll t \ll \tau_{\text{vort}}$ over which $C(\mathbf{r}, t) \sim t^{-(1+\alpha)}$, with no rigorous theory for α , but strong arguments for $\alpha < 1$. [7]

Below the threshold disorder strength, such that $\xi = \infty$, the XYRVP model may be used to calculate the $C(\mathbf{r}, t)$. This gives a weak modification of the η exponent by quenched impurities but leaves the results otherwise unchanged. Above threshold, the effects of disorder are stronger. Eq. 11 may then be used, leading to the perturbative result in Eq. 3. As for the pure case, such non-zero $J_d(V)$ cannot persist in the thermodynamic limit. Similar considerations give the result for the dirty screening length quoted in the introduction.

Two different behaviors are expected for weak disorder depending upon sample size. If $L < \lambda$, the low V divergence of $J(V)$ is cut off by decoherence as phasons scatter off the leads. For large samples ($L > \lambda$), the perturbative results are only valid when $L_V < \lambda(V)$, with system in a strong coupling, nonperturbative in Δ regime for lower bias. In this limit, we expect a *linear* response on general hydrodynamic grounds. In the presence of tunneling and impurities, the only operative conservation laws are for total charge and energy. Hence, the low-frequency, long-wavelength equations of motion (in addition to that for ϕ) must take the form

$$\partial_t n_i = -\gamma_{ij}\mu_j - \partial_\mu j_i^\mu, \quad (12)$$

where n_i and μ_i are, respectively, the density and chemical potential in layer i , $\gamma_{ij} = \gamma(2\delta_{ij} - 1)$, $j_i^\mu = \sigma_{ij}^{\mu\nu}\partial_\nu\mu_j$ are the in-plane currents, and repeated indices are summed. Note that Eq. 12 combined with the QH condition $\sigma_{ii}^{xx} \ll \sigma_{ii}^{xy}$, gives a classical description of edge transport. The coefficient γ thereby provides a hydrodynamic definition of the tunneling “conductivity”, closely related to the true measured inter-layer conductance. For zero tunneling, $n_1 - n_2$ is conserved, and model F (xy-ferromagnet) hydrodynamics should apply. [10] Hence, for small Δ , we expect that $\gamma(\Delta)$ is determined by the *classical* crossover between these two limits, which to our knowledge is not understood. A scaling approach which assumes a direct crossover suggests (for weak disorder) $\gamma \sim (k_BT/\hbar)(\mathcal{E}_l/k_BT)^{4/(4-\eta)}(\Delta/\rho_s)^{2/(4-\eta)}$. At low T (especially for stronger disorder), where the renormalized Δ becomes large already in the quantum regime, the crossover to the hydrodynamic limit takes place in at least two stages, and is more difficult to estimate. The general picture which emerges, however, is that tunneling currents are screened to sample boundaries. Even at low T , this is expected to lead to *linear* transport as $V \rightarrow 0$, and for particular parameters this limit can be analytically studied using Eq. 12.

Although a detailed analysis of the strong coupling crossover is difficult, for very weak disorder, the above scaling considerations are corroborated by a complementary *semiclassical* analysis, which treats the kinetic and tunneling terms on equal footing. As a test of principle, we have considered in detail an idealized pure system with parallel side contacts. We find that the current is then carried by a “half soliton” pinned to the contacts. Dissipation arises due to a non-local Caldeira-Leggett coupling arising from the leads. This gives a linear I-V curve at low bias with a conductance that has the same scaling form and magnitude as predicted by the hydrodynamic approach above.

L.B. was supported by the NSF-DMR-9985255, L.R. acknowledges support by the NSF DMR-9625111, and by the Sloan and Packard Foundations.

-
- [1] J. P. Eisenstein *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 1383 (1992).
 - [2] X.-G. Wen and A. Zee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 1811 (1992).
 - [3] S. Q. Murphy *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 782 (1994).
 - [4] K. Moon *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 5138 (1995); K. Yang *et al.*, *ibid.* **54**, 11644 (1996).
 - [5] I. B. Spielman *et al.*, cond-mat/0002387.
 - [6] J.M. Kosterlitz and D. Thouless, J. Phys. C **6**, 1181 (1973).
 - [7] L. Balents and L. Radzihovsky, unpublished.
 - [8] A. Stern, *et al.*, cond-mat/9908251.
 - [9] T. Nattermann, *et al.*, J. de Physique I **5**, 565 (1995).
 - [10] B.I. Halperin and P. Hohenberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. **49**, 435 (1987).